



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,111	03/24/2004	Yin-Hung Chen	OP-093000203	2514
7590 07/26/2005			EXAMINER	
Yi-Wen Tseng 4331 Stevens Battle Lane Fairfax, VA 22033			EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/807,111

Applicant(s)

CHEN, YIN-HUNG

Examiner

Anthony Q. Edwards

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors, e.g., claim 1, lines 4 and 5 recite a “stacked first access units installed in an upper close to the rear panel.” The Examiner can only assume that applicant is referring to the upper portion of the case. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,435 Davis et al. (“Davis” hereinafter). Referring to claim 1, Davis discloses an internal arrangement of a computer case (see Fig. 1), which clear a space between a second access unit (not numbered) and a motherboard (16) by changing an allocation of a first access unit (not numbered), comprising a case (10) with a front (not numbered) and a rear panel (22), and a plurality of stacked first access units installed in an upper portion (*sic*) close to the rear panel (22), wherein the stacked first access units are allocated in the upper portion close to the

Art Unit: 2835

rear panel of the case allowing air entering the case to flow and deliver heat source to the back of the case, and provide a disk array with more data storage space. See Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 2, Davis discloses an arrangement of a computer case, wherein the case includes a bottom portion (not numbered), the front panel and the rear panel adjacent to two opposing sides of the bottom portion, the front and rear panels form a receiving space (see Fig. 1).

Referring to claim 3, Davis discloses an arrangement of a computer case, further comprising a motherboard (16) disposed within the receiving space over the bottom portion. See Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 4, Davis discloses an arrangement of a computer case, further comprising a second access unit (i.e., under element 14) under the first access unit within the receiving space (see Fig. 1).

Referring to claim 6, Davis discloses an arrangement of a computer case, inherently comprising a plurality of connectors with various pins, a heat dissipation device (i.e., fan) and a power supply (15) installed on the rear panel (22). See Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Davis. Although Davis does not specifically disclose the type of drive positioned in the second access unit, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

Art Unit: 2835

skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide either a 3.5" floppy disk or compact disk in the second access unit, since it has been held that rearranging part of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2005/0117287 to Hsu et al. ("Hsu" hereinafter).

Referring to claim 7, Davis discloses the invention as claimed, except for a pair of support members extending between the front and rear panels. Hsu teaches providing a mechanism for removing an electronic device from a PC, wherein the mechanism includes a pair of support members (i.e., upstanding walls) forming a space for receiving a first access unit (40) therein. See Fig. 1 and paragraph [0013]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the arrangement of Davis with a mechanism for removing an electronic device from a PC support member having a pair of support members extending between the front and rear panels of a PC, as taught by Hsu, since the device of would provide the computer arrangement Davis with mechanism for quickly removing or installing disk drives or similar memory devices.

Referring to claim 8, Davis in view of Hsu disclose an arrangement of a computer case, wherein the first access unit includes a box member (20) and a hard disk (40) disposed in the box member. See paragraph [0014] of Hsu.

Referring to claim 9, Davis in view of Hsu disclose an arrangement of a computer case, wherein the box member (20) includes a plurality of connection members (211) formed along a periphery thereof to be fitted with the support members. See Fig. 1 and paragraph [0014] of Hsu.

Referring to claim 10, Davis in view of Hsu disclose an arrangement of a computer case, wherein the box member includes a terminal at one end thereof. Although not shown, a terminal member is inherently provided at the box for electrical communication.

Conclusion


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2835

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 25, 2005
aqe



LYNN FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800